



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/437,006	11/09/1999	TAMMY ZHENG	PHA 51219	7398
75	90 08/15/2002			
Corporate Patent Counsel Philips Electronics North America Corporation 580 White Plains Road			EXAMINER	
			BROWN, CHARLOTTE A	
Tarrytown, NY	10591		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	13
•			DATE MAILED: 08/15/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			AS
	Application No.	pplicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/437,006	09/437,006 ZHENG ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charlotte A. Brown	1765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 07 August 2002 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11.	to avoid abandonment of the er: (1) a timely filed amendm ppeal (with appeal fee); or (	is application. A proper reply nent which places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing d	late of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 720 2749.	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejection.	
706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). To lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of 67 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorb) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three larned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	extension and the corresponding amo tened statutory period for reply origin	ount of the fee. The appropriate exten ally set in the final Office action; or (2)	sion fee under as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
· (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicat issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without ca NOTE:	nceling a corresponding nun	nber of finally rejected claims	<b>;</b> .
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed a	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NOT	place the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed S	OLELY to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim			nd an
. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a)☐ approved or b)☐	disapproved by the Examin	ier.

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner contends that it is appropriate to combine Grimbergen and Witek. Grimbergen does not teach a second plasma etch that includes HBr and nitrogen. Witek teaches a second etch stage that includes HBr and nitrogen (Column 5, lines 24-33). It is the Examiner's position that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify Grimbergen by adding nitrogen to the second etch chemistry as taught by Witek. The additional step of adding nitrogen, an inert carrier gas, to the etching environment would have been anticipated in order to further etch an opening in the polysilicon layer, the device layer. The applicant also argues that the references do not address the notching effect problem decribed and illustrated in Figure 1 of the instant patent applicatation. The Examiner asserts that the applicant's limitation of the notching problem is not commensurate with the applicant's claim language.

BENJAMIN L. UTECH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

min